

REMARKS

Claim 1 is currently amended. Claims 10-11, 13, 27-43 were previously canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 12, 14-26, and 44 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 4, 2011 with Applicant's representative, Gregory M. Taylor. During the interview, amendments to claim 1 corresponding to those presented herein were discussed in relation to the cited prior art. The Examiner agreed that amended claim 1 was not disclosed by the cited prior art, but indicated that a further search and consideration was required.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 14-16, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,786,446) in view of Hisao et al. (Japanese Patent App. No. 2235729). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of producing a plurality of soft contact lenses comprising:

...

B. forming said material into a plurality of shaped lens blanks through controlled application of physical force to the material by compression of the material between *a plurality of form or platen pairs arranged in an array to simultaneously press together the material into a plurality of shaped lens blanks* in a process selected from the group consisting of thermoforming, vacuum forming, pressing, hot moulding, cold moulding, and compression moulding; and

...

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is shown in Figure 1 of the application as filed.

There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references, either alone or in combination, of all the limitations now recited in claim 1. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion of a “*plurality of form or platen pairs arranged in an array to simultaneously press together the material into a plurality of shaped lens blanks*” as recited in claim 1.

In contrast, Hammar discloses a process in which individual lens shaped blanks are formed into molded lens articles. Hisao discloses a process in which individual lenses are formed one at a time as a strip of sheet material 7 passes in sequence between two dies 1, 1'; 2, 2', etc.

Thus, even if the teachings of Hammar and Hisao are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claim 1 are met.

Accordingly, claim 1 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Since claims 2, 5, 7-9, 14-16, 23, and 24 depend from claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1, these dependent claims would also not have been obvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 14-16, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Hassan et al., *Water Solubility Characteristics of Poly(Vinyl Alcohol) and Gel Prepared By Freezing/Thawing Processes*, Water Soluble Polymers, Plenum Press, pp. 31-40 (1998). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of Hassan as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

As a result, claims 3 and 4 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Iwaseya et al. (J MATER SCI 41 (2006) 1979-1982). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and thus includes all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of Iwaseya as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

As a result, claim 6 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,652,721). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and thus includes all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of Miller as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

As a result, claim 12 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Le Vay (U.S. Patent No. 5,166,528). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of LeVay as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

Hence, claims 17 and 18 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Voss et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0112008). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1 and thus includes all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of Voss as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

As a result, claim 19 would not have been obvious over the Hammar in view of Hisao and Voss.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, in view of Voss, and further in view of Jux (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,465). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 20 and 21 depend indirectly from claim 1 through claim 19 and thus include all the limitations of claims 1 and 19. As discussed above, claim 19 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao and Voss. Adding the teachings of Jux as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

Thus, claims 20 and 21 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Herbrechtsmeier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,113,817). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 22 and 44 depend from claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of Herbrechtsmeier as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

As a result, claims 22 and 44 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 22 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Hisao, and further in view of Biel et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0163638). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed previously, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hammar in view of Hisao. Adding the teachings of Biel as proposed by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

Hence, claims 25 and 26 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/597,172

Filing Date: 7/13/2006

Attorney Docket No. 156.001US01

Title: MOULDING PROCESS

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 4, 2011

/GREGORY M. TAYLOR/

Gregory M. Taylor
Reg. No. 34,263

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
5810 W. 78th Street, Ste. 100
Minneapolis, MN 55439
T – (952) 465-0770
F – (952) 465-0771